



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,493	07/23/2003	William E. Rich	016866-009520US	1999
20350	7590	02/06/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			LAM, ANN Y	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EIGHTH FLOOR			1641	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,493	RICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ann Y. Lam	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/6/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5, recites that the affinity molecule is selected from a group that include a nucleic acid. However, claim 5 depends from claim 1, which exclude the affinity molecule from being a nucleic acid. (Claim 5 will be interpreted to exclude a nucleic acid for examination purposes.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-23 and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutchens et al., 6,225,047.

As to claims 1, 3, 13, 14, 15, 21, 25, 28, 29 and 33, Hutchens et al. disclose an assay method utilizing an adsorbent comprising a polypeptide (col. 5, lines 21-22) and contacting the adsorbent with a sample containing analytes and detecting the retention of adsorbed analytes by desorption spectrometry (col. 18, lines 25-32) such as SELDI (col. 24, lines 46-49) as well as detecting the materials that are unretained on the adsorbent (col. 36, lines 63-67), and wherein eluants include salt concentrations of various concentrations (col. 31, lines 2-6), and that the analytes which may be resolved using the disclosed method include fragments of biological macromolecules (col. 34, lines 9-15.) The fragments are deemed to be the claimed first and second components of a multicomponent biological complex.

As to claim 2, the sample is blood (col. 15, lines 8-12.)

As to claim 4, the analyte may be a multimeric molecular complex (col. 5, lines 16-17) and a complex refers to analytes formed by the union of 2 or more analytes (col. 15, lines 1-2.)

As to claims 5 and 6, a receptor is used to bind to a ligand and is subsequently contacted with a sample to detect binding to the ligand (col. 44, lines 21-37.)

As to claim 8, the solid support can be a chromatographic resin (col. 18, lines 34-35.)

As to claims 9 and 10, the washes may be performed in wells (which is a non-flow-through device), (col. 20, lines 13-21.)

As to claims 11 and 12, the washes may be performed in a flow-through column (col. 21, lines 13-14.)

As to claims 16, 26, 30, 32 and 34, eluants that are different may be used (col. 31, lines 37-41 and col. 31, lines 2-4.)

As to claim 17, the second component can be detected by optical method (e.g., fluorescence detection), (col. 25, lines 41-44.)

As to claims 18 and 19, the second component can be detected by affinity mass spectrometry (col. 24, lines 55-56.)

As to claim 20, the affinity mass spectrometry comprises SEND (col. 24, line 64.)

As to claims 22, 23 and 35, the method is performed on two samples, one of from normal human serum and one fro diseased serum, and comparison of the results is performed (col. 12, lines 30-44.)

As to claims 27 and 31, a computerized learning algorithm classifies a profile (col. 7, lines 41-65.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchens et al., 6,225,047.

Hutchens et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed (see above), except for exposing one sample to an inhibitor RNA, and not exposing the other sample to the inhibitory RNA.

However, Hutchens et al. do teach that the analytes may be of various biological materials (col. 34, lines 1-42), and that the eluant may be of various characteristics as desired and can be chosen for a given analyte without the need for undue experimentation (col. 33, lines 12-22), and that the amount detected in the assay is usually compared to a control or standard curve (col. 42, lines 50-52.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the disclosed method wherein one sample is exposed to an inhibitor RNA, and the other is not, because Hutchens et al. teach use of a control. While the control disclosed by Hutchens et al. is for quantity determinations, the skilled artisan would recognize that controls can also be a negative control, in which case no reagents (such as inhibitor RNA) are introduced, as would be desirable for verifying results. Moreover, use of inhibitor RNA would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because Hutchens et al. disclose that the eluant may be of various characteristics as desired and can be chosen for a given analyte without the need for undue experimentation.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchens et al., 6,225,047, in view of Beutler et al., 5,234,811.

Hutchens et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed (see above regarding claim 1), except for the affinity molecule being bound to the solid support after binding the complex.

However, Beutler et al. teach that probe/target hybrids may be selectively isolated on a solid matrix, such as hydroxylapatite, which preferentially binds double-stranded nucleic acids. Beutler et al. teach that this is an alternative to immobilizing probe nucleic acids on a solid support and using it to capture target sequences from solution (col. 14, lines 34-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow binding between the double stranded nucleic acid molecules to its target in the Hutchens et al. invention before immobilizing the nucleic acid to a solid support because Beutler et al. teach that probe/target hybrids may be selectively isolated on a solid matrix, such as hydroxylapatite, which preferentially binds double-stranded nucleic acids and that this is an alternative to immobilizing probe nucleic acids on a solid support before capturing its target.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 15, 2006 have been fully considered. Applicant's amendment to the claims have overcome the grounds for rejection in the previous Office action. Moreover, Applicant's argument regarding claims 13 and 20 are persuasive. The previous Office action did not take into consideration that claim 1 recites measuring a second component in the elution washes, and claims 13 and 20

further recite use of a SELDI or SEND, which measures components that bind to the solid support. The present Office action however relies on the Hutchens et al. reference to show that this is taught in the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 10-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



2/4/07

ANN YEN LAM
PATENT EXAMINER